



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/721,723

11/25/2003

Michael P. Corcoran

C516.12-0005

5761

164 7590 12/08/2008
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

TRUONG, KEVIN THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3734

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/721,723	Applicant(s) CORCORAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin T. Truong	Art Unit 3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/26/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Note: This is in response the amendment filed 09/26/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066) and further in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066).

3. As to claims 1, 2, 6-14, 37, 38, and 41-48, Maahs discloses the claimed invention in figures 6-8 and 10-11, an occlusion device (70) comprises a plurality of ribs (72) extending from the proximal end of the center post (62) to the distal end of the center post (62); and a silicon foam or silicon balloon (76) attached between the plurality of ribs (74,75) and the shaft may be used to expand the expansion ribs (72) to its enlarged condition (col. 2, lines 51-56 and col. 7, lines 3-7). Note that Maahs described in figures 6, 7, and 16, the frame of filter (70) having a greater diameter at its proximal end than its distal end. As a result, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make a diameter of ribs (72) near the proximal end of the center post (62) greater than a diameter of the ribs (72) near the distal end of the center post. Since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

4. Claims 3, 4, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066). Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a first segment including a pin and second segment including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Tanner et al teaches in figure 2A, that it is known in the surgical art to have center post (10) comprises a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Maahs center post by substituting for the center post having a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment as taught by Tanner et al. in order to permits expansion of the vessel necks and/or ends without negatively impacting the connection between the graft and the vessel wall.

5. Claims 5, 15-17, 20-27, and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066). Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs attach. Corcoran et al teaches in figures 2 and 15, that it is known in the surgical art to have the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs passing through the holes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Maahs center post with holes located at its ends to which the ribs can be

passed through as taught by Corcoran so that it is less likely to be sheared off or permanently linked since the edges of the hole are beveled or rounded.

6. Claims 18, 19, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maahs (U.S. 5,846,260) in view of Corcoran et al. (U.S. 6,635,066) and further in view of Tanner et al. (U.S. 6,635,066).

Maahs discloses the claimed invention, as state above except for the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs attach and the center post comprises a first segment including a pin and second segment including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. Corcoran et al teaches in figures 2 and 15, that it is known in the surgical art to have the center post comprises a plurality of holes through which the ribs passing through the holes. Tanner et al teaches in figure 2A, that it is known in the surgical art to have center post (10) comprises a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Maahs center post with holes located at its ends to which the ribs can be passed through as taught by Corcoran so that it is less likely to be sheared off or permanently linked since the edges of the hole are beveled or rounded and furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Maahs center post by substituting for the center post having a first segment (22) including a pin and second segment (11) including a lumen for engaging the pin of the first segment as taught by Tanner et al. in

order to permits expansion of the vessel necks and/or ends without negatively impacting the connection between the graft and the vessel wall.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that Maahs device is incapable of performing a barrier to prevent blood from entering or exiting the left atrial appendage as recited in independent claims 1, 15, 26, and 37, because it is designed with mesh that entraps embolic material. The examiner's position that Maahs device described a silicon foam or silicon balloon (76) attached between the plurality of ribs (74,75) and the shaft may be used to expand the expansion ribs (72) to its enlarged condition (col. 2, lines 51-56 and col. 7, lines 3-12). At least for this reason, the Maahs device is clearly capable of preventing the flow of blood from entering or exiting the LAA.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM..

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin T. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3734

Kevin T. Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3734